



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR           | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/002,554      | 11/01/2001  | John William Forsyth Macartney | 30011271 US01       | 3793             |

7590

09/16/2005

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
10th Floor  
One Landmark Square  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

| EXAMINER |
|----------|
|----------|

AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2642

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 10/002,554             | MACARTNEY ET AL.    |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi    | 2642                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zolotov (US PAT # 6,718,023).

Regarding claim 1, Zolotov teaches an apparatus for processing data records (this reads on 2, lines 1-12), the apparatus comprising: means for receiving data records of a plurality of different types (see col. 2, lines 10-12 and col. 6, lines 11-20), each type having a different predetermined format (this simply reads on collecting

Art Unit: 2642

information such as voice and data for example, which both have different format, see col. 1, lines 33-37 and col. 3, lines 32-34); a plurality of type-specific function libraries (reads on CDR 1, CDR 2, and CDR N as shown in Fig. 6, col. 3, lines 35-37 and lines 50-53), each library (CDR) having functions associated with each of the particular types of data record (the "functions" read on the pre-defined rules, see col. 3, lines 59-63); means for reading the contents of the type-specific library(ies) associated with the particular type of data records to be received (this basically reads on analyzing the received information, which is inherent feature since all CDR must be analyzed then stored based on their type); means for processing received data records according to the particular functions to be performed (see col. 3, lines 27-37 and col. 3, lines 40-67); and an output for rendering the processed data records (this basically reads on any display device that is capable of displaying the processed data, which is inherent in the computer shown in Central Computer Site (SCE) 36 in Fig. 1).

Zolotov teaches that Front End System (FES) probe is adapted to collect the input information signaling and/or bearer (bearer is voice, fax, or data, see col. 4, lines 21-22), and perform the initial processing of these information according to their type (see col. 4, lines 47-67). However, Zolotov does not specifically teach receiving instructions indicative of the particular type(s) of data records to be received and indicative of which particular functions are to be performed on the data records to be received.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the system provides some instruction that can be assigned to each type of data record and method for processing these data record in order to enhance the efficiency by avoiding errors and fault processing methods.

Claims 5, 14, 18 and 27-30 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Zolotov teaches at least one database (element 40 in Fig. 1) coupled to the output for storing the processed data records (see Fig. 1 "CCS" element 36).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Zolotov teaches a set of common functions (reads on the pre-defined rules, see col. 3, lines 59-67), wherein the particular functions to be performed on the data records to be received can include one or more common functions from the set of common functions.

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Zolotov teaches the use of a system management functions (see col. 2, lines 1-6 and lines 18-41).

Regarding claims 6 and 19, Zolotov teaches determining which functions from the contents of the type-specific function library(ies) are to be utilized in processing the

Art Unit: 2642

received data records (this basically reads on which rules to be use in order to process the received data, see col. 47-56).

Regarding claims 7 and 20, Zolotov teaches one of the types of data records is a Call Detail Record (see col. 2, lines 1-6).

Claims 8-9 and 21-22 recite the use of "a Transaction Detail Record and a Service Detail Record". Zolotov teaches the user of a Call Data Record (CDR), see col. 2, lines 1-6. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any kind of a data record based on need of the user/customer. Different data records can be customized in the system as desired.

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Zolotov teaches the at least one of the data records originates from a Signaling System No. 7 network (see col. 3, lines 1-4 and col. 6, lines 32-36).

Regarding claims 11 and 24, Zolotov teaches the at least one of the data records originates from a GSM network (see col. 1, lines 34-38).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Zolotov teaches the at least one of the data records originates from an Intelligent Network Application Part (INAP) network (see col. 6, lines 56-58).

Regarding claims 13 and 26, Zolotov teaches the at least one of the data records originates from an Internet Protocol (IP) network (col. 6, lines 32-36).

***Conclusion***

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.

**Examiner**  
**Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi**  
**Art Unit 2642**  
**09/09/2005**